

A SHARP THRESHOLD FOR KAZHDAN'S PROPERTY (T)

CHRISTOPHER HOFFMAN, MATTHEW KAHLE, AND ELLIOT PAQUETTE

ABSTRACT. We show that $p = 2 \log n/n$ is a sharp threshold for the fundamental group of random 2-complexes to have Kazhdan's property (T). This concurs with the threshold for the vanishing of the first homology, found earlier by Linial and Meshulam. Establishing this threshold requires new estimates and concentration results for the spectral gap of Erdős-Rényi random graphs near the connectivity threshold, which are of independent interest.

1. INTRODUCTION

In a seminal paper [25] Linial and Meshulam defined a family of random 2-dimensional simplicial complexes based on Erdős-Rényi random graphs and they found a sharp threshold for vanishing of first homology of a random complex. They proved that the threshold function is $2 \log(n)/n$, a higher-dimensional analogue of the Erdős-Rényi threshold for connectivity of the random graph $G(n, p)$ [12]. This paper inspired several other articles which have explored the topology of random simplicial complexes [2, 23, 27, 24, 1].

Random simplicial complexes have also been studied for their expansion properties as well as their topological properties. Expansion in graphs has received an enormous amount of study over the past decades have been useful across a wide range of fields in mathematics and computer science including algorithm design, sorting networks, computational complexity theory and cryptography. The expansion properties of random graphs have played a major role in this development as the existence of a family of expander graphs was first shown using random d -regular graphs, see [4, 7, 29, 30]. In the case of Erdős-Rényi graphs when p is slightly larger than the threshold for connectivity Benjamini, Haber, Krivelevich, and Lubetzky calculated the Cheeger constant. [6]

In recent years higher dimensional analogues of edge expansion have received more attention. Linial and Meshulam's proof depends on "cohomological expansion," a higher-dimensional analogue of edge expansion for graphs. This is closely related to the algebraic isoperimetry recently discussed by Gromov [22]. See [11] for a fuller discussion of these definitions in the context of random polyhedra, as well as [34] and [14] for applications to embedding and geometric overlap properties.

The group-theoretic analogue of edge expansion for graphs is Kazhdan's property (T). Informally, a group G having property (T) means that if G acts unitarily on a Hilbert space and has almost invariant vectors, then it has a nonzero invariant

Date: January 4, 2012.

The first author was supported by an AMS Centennial Fellowship and NSF grant DMS - 0806024. The second author was supported by NSA grant H98230-10-1-0227. The third author was supported by NSF grants DMS-0847661 and DMS - 0806024.

vector. See the monograph [5] for a comprehensive overview of groups with property (T).

Property (T) has found uses in many different areas. Margulis noted that Cayley graphs of finite quotients of an infinite discrete group with property (T) gives an expanding family of graphs, providing the first explicit examples of such families [26]. Groups with property (T) lead to good mixing properties in ergodic theory — a process which mixes slowly must leave some subsets almost invariant. If a group Γ has property (T) if every ergodic Γ system is also strongly ergodic [21].

In this paper we show that the threshold for $\pi_1(Y)$ to have property (T) agrees almost precisely with the vanishing threshold for $H_1(Y, \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$. The main idea is to show that all of the vertex links are connected, and that the normalized graph Laplacians of all the vertex links have sufficiently large spectral gap. Then we apply a condition for property (T) due to Żuk [36] — see also Ballman and Swiatkowski [3], and Garland [20].

Theorem 1.1 (Żuk). *If X is a pure 2-dimensional locally-finite simplicial complex so that for every vertex v , the vertex link $lk_v(X)$ is connected and the normalized Laplacian $L = L(lk_v(X))$ has smallest positive eigenvalue $\lambda_2(L) > 1/2$, then $\pi_1(X)$ has property (T).*

Define $Y(n, p)$ to be the probability distribution on all simplicial complexes with n vertices, $\binom{n}{2}$ edges, and with each 2-dimensional face included independently with probability p . Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\omega \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and $Y \in Y(n, p)$.*

(1) *If*

$$p \leq \frac{2 \log n - \omega}{n}$$

then $\mathbb{P}[\pi_1(Y) \text{ has property (T)}] \rightarrow 0$, and

(2) *if*

$$p \geq \frac{2 \log n + \omega \sqrt{\log n} \log \log n}{n}$$

then $\mathbb{P}[\pi_1(Y) \text{ has property (T)}] \rightarrow 1$.

The threshold for property (T) is sharp, in the sense that the transition from probability $\rightarrow 0$ to probability $\rightarrow 1$, happens in a narrow window, as in Section 3 of Friedgut and Kalai [16].

In order to apply Theorem 1.1, we develop new estimates and concentration results for the spectral gap of Erdos-Renyi random graphs near the threshold for connectivity. This constitutes most of this paper and is done in Section 2. Noting that the distribution of vertex link is that of an Erdős-Rényi random graph, we establish the following which improves on several earlier results (see Section 2.1 for some background).

Theorem 1.3. *Fix $k \geq 0$, and let G be an Erdős-Rényi random graph chosen from the distribution $G(n, p)$. Let $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of L . There is a constant $C = C(k)$ so that when*

$$p \geq \frac{(k+1) \log n + C \sqrt{\log n} \log \log n}{n}$$

is satisfied, then

$$\lambda_2 > 1/2,$$

with probability $1 - o(n^{-k})$.

For our property (T) results we only require the case $k = 1$. There are only n vertex links, and each fails the spectral gap condition with probability $1 - o(n^{-1})$, so a union bound establishes the main result. Nevertheless we state the main spectral gap result with greater generality, because we expect that it may have other applications, for example in random topology and geometry. The case $k = 0$ is of particular interest as it gets close to the connectivity threshold $p = \log n/n$. For a stronger but slightly more complicated version of Theorem 1.3, see Theorem 2.1.

2. SPECTRAL GAP

2.1. Background: random Matrices and spectral gaps. One of the central problems in modern probability theory is to determine the spectrum of a random symmetric matrix. Questions about the spectrum of a random matrix are typically classified into global statistics (e.g. the limiting empirical spectral distribution) and local statistics (e.g. typical spacings between eigenvalues). Among the global statistics, one finds Wigner's semicircle law, which states that *Wigner* matrices – random Hermitian matrices with centered, independent entries of identical variance – have a universal limiting distribution under mild moment and smoothness conditions.

Among the local statistics, questions are typically further classified into *bulk* statistics, those which pertain to eigenvalues a bounded distance from the spectral edge, and *edge* statistics which pertain to extremal eigenvalues. In the case of Wigner matrices, many of these questions have been resolved in very great generality (see, e.g. [32]). Among the edge statistics, the most pertinent is the distribution of the largest eigenvalue, which has been established for a large class of Wigner matrices ([31]) and for which it is seen that

$$\lambda_1 \sim 2\sigma\sqrt{n} + Xn^{1/6}$$

where σ^2 is the variance of an entry of the matrix, and X follows the Tracy-Widom law.

A related question, and what we need here, is to determine the “gap” between the first and second eigenvalues of the spectrum. Unlike in the Wigner case, where these two will be vanishingly close, the entries of our matrices have nonzero, identical expectations. This has the effect of boosting the largest eigenvalue beyond the remainder of the spectrum, producing a large gap. Estimating this gap typically arises in the study of adjacency and Laplacian matrices of graphs, where its applications include determining the mixing time of Markov chains and quantifying the expansion properties of a graph, to name a few (see [9] for further applications).

However, the matrices which we study here are paradigmatically much different from the Wigner matrices in more ways than just this. Many of the results about Wigner matrices, such as the semicircle law, require hypotheses that exclude adjacency matrices of very sparse random graphs. Along this line of development, the *given degree distribution* model of random graphs, which generalizes Erdős-Rényi, can have empirical spectral distributions that are approximately power law distributed, with appropriate choice of parameters [8].

Furthermore, many of the tools which were developed for estimation of the spectral gap were designed with Wigner matrices in mind, and thus their usefulness for

matrices of sparse graphs is limited. In particular, we recall the bound of Füredi and Komlós [19] which can be extended to show that when $p \gg \log^6 n/n$, the spectral gap of the adjacency matrix of an Erdős-Rényi graph is of smaller order than the largest eigenvalue. Improvements along this line of reasoning bring the range of feasible p to as low as $p \gg \log^2 n/n$ [33, 8].

Beyond the difficulties with having lopsided entries, the normalized Laplacian matrices we study differ from these random matrices in that they have globally dependent entries. Letting T be the diagonal matrix of degrees and letting A be the adjacency matrix, the normalized Laplacian is defined as

$$L = I - T^{-1/2}AT^{-1/2}.$$

In what follows, let $0 = \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n \leq 2$ be the eigenvalues of L . A good introduction to the properties of the normalized Laplacian are available in [9] (note this is Chung's $\mathcal{L}$). We note that some authors use an alternate definition of normalized Laplacian, with a 1 on the diagonal if and only if the corresponding vertex has an edge. The two definitions agree when the graph is connected, and this will be the case here. The principle nontrivial property we will employ about L is that the dimension of the kernel is equal to the number of components (excepting isolated vertices) of G . An immediate consequence is that for a graph with multiple nontrivial components, there is no spectral gap; in particular, for $p \ll \log n/n$, the spectral gap of the normalized Laplacian is 0.

The global dependence alone is not enough to disturb some of the Wigner-like features of L ; especially, for $p \gg \log^2 n/n$, the smallest positive eigenvalue of L is $1 - o(1)$. More generally, Chung, Lu and Vu [8] show that

$$\max_{i \neq 1} |1 - \lambda_i| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{np}} + \text{error}.$$

As the entries of $T^{-1/2}AT^{-1/2}$ have variance roughly on the order of $1/n^2p$, the order of this bound agrees with what is seen in the Wigner case.

The method used to prove these bounds is the vaunted trace method, ubiquitous in random matrix theory, of estimating the expectation of high powers of the trace of a matrix. The state-of-the-art for this method is precisely what produces the spectral gap bound in the $p \gg \log^2 n/n$ regime. This method starts to lose effectiveness as the density of edges decreases to the connectivity threshold, where the cost of estimating a single eigenvalue by a trace becomes too high. In sparser regimes, alternative methods have been developed for controlling the spectral gap. In particular, we would like to draw attention to the method of Kahn and Szemerédi [17].

The method of Kahn and Szemerédi, first developed for bounding the spectral gap of d -regular graphs, has already been used quite successfully for estimating the spectral gap in the sparse regime. Coja-Oghlan [10] shows that with $p \geq c \log n/n$, the gap is $1 - O(1/\sqrt{np})$, and Feige and Ofek [13] show an analogous claim for the adjacency matrix. Our main contribution in this direction is to establish that for $p \gg \log n/n$, the spectral gap goes to 1. Our methods are not able to reproduce the expected rate, and instead we are able to show the gap is $1 - O((np)^{-1/4+\epsilon})$. Nonetheless, we get sufficiently sharp bounds that we can apply Theorem 1.1.

2.2. Spectral gap theorem. Our main spectral gap theorem is the following.

Theorem 2.1. *Let G be an Erdős-Renyi random graph chosen from the distribution $G(n, p)$. Let $d = (n - 1)p$ be the expected degree of each vertex. Let L be the normalized Laplacian of G and let $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of L . For any ϵ , $1/4 \geq \epsilon > 0$, any $c > 0$, and any $k \geq 0$, then there is a constant $C = C(\epsilon, k)$ so that when*

$$p \geq \frac{(k + 1) \log n + C[\log n]^{1-2\epsilon} \log \log n}{n}$$

then

$$\max_{i \neq 1} |1 - \lambda_i| < cd^{-1/4+\epsilon}$$

with probability $1 - o(n^{-k})$.

Given the graph G with vertices $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ we define the matrix

$$M_{u,v} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\deg(u)}\sqrt{\deg(v)}} & \text{if } u \leftrightarrow v, \\ 0 & \text{if } u \nleftrightarrow v. \end{cases}$$

Thus if all degrees are positive we have

$$M = T^{-1/2} A T^{-1/2},$$

and it is easily checked that $T^{1/2}\mathbf{1}$ is an eigenvector with eigenvalue one. However, even in the case that some degrees are 0, it can be checked that $T^{1/2}\mathbf{1}$ is an eigenvector with eigenvalue 1 so long as the graph has an edge. We label the eigenvalues of M by $1 = \tilde{\lambda}_1 \geq \tilde{\lambda}_2 \geq \dots \geq \tilde{\lambda}_n$ of M . The starting point of our argument is the variational characterization of the eigenvalues which states that

$$\tilde{\lambda}_2 = \inf_{v \neq 0} \sup_{\substack{w \perp v \\ \|w\|=1}} w^t M w.$$

The first bound is made by estimating the infimum by

$$\tilde{\lambda}_2 \leq \sup_{\substack{w \perp \mathbf{1} \\ \|w\|=1}} w^t M w,$$

which, when the degrees of the graph are concentrating around their mean, is very nearly the minimum. Additional flexibility is provided by replacing this symmetric version of the Rayleigh quotient by the asymmetric version,

$$(1) \quad \tilde{\lambda}_2 \leq \sup_{\substack{w \perp \mathbf{1}, v \perp \mathbf{1} \\ \|v\|=\|w\|=1}} v^t M w.$$

With a little extra work, it is possible to also estimate $\tilde{\lambda}_2 \vee |\tilde{\lambda}_n|$. If $\tilde{\lambda}_n \geq 0$, then this is simply $\tilde{\lambda}_2$ and there is nothing to do. Otherwise, we would like to bound $-\tilde{\lambda}_n$ from above. Using the variational characterization once more, this has the exact value

$$-\tilde{\lambda}_n = - \inf_{\substack{w \\ \|w\|=1}} w^t M w = \sup_{\substack{w \\ \|w\|=1}} (-w^t M w).$$

For each w , orthogonally decompose it as $w = u + v$, where $v \perp \mathbf{1}$. As each entry of M is non-negative, $-u^t M u \leq 0$, and thus

$$-w^t M w \leq -v^t M u - u^t M v - v^t M v = -2v^t M u - v^t M v,$$

where the symmetry of M has been used. Taking absolute values, this can be bounded by

$$-2v^t M u - v^t M v \leq 2|v^t M u| + |v^t M v| \leq \left[\sup_{\substack{x \perp \mathbf{1}, y \\ \|x\|=\|y\|=1}} |x^t M y| \right] [2\|u\|\|v\| + \|v\|^2].$$

Using that $\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 = 1$, it follows that

$$-\tilde{\lambda}_n \leq 2 \left[\sup_{\substack{x \perp \mathbf{1}, y \\ \|x\|=\|y\|=1}} |x^t M y| \right].$$

Recalling that $\tilde{\lambda}_2$ had a similar bound (1), it follows that the expression $\tilde{\lambda}_2 \vee |\tilde{\lambda}_n|$ may be bounded by

$$(2) \quad \tilde{\lambda}_2 \vee |\tilde{\lambda}_n| \leq 2 \left[\sup_{\substack{x \perp \mathbf{1}, y \\ \|x\|=\|y\|=1}} |x^t M y| \right].$$

2.3. Outline. We begin with a relaxation lemma. This turns the problem of finding the spectral gap, which requires finding the supremum over an infinite set, to a problem that involves finding the maximum over a finite set. The cost of this relaxation is just a constant factor.

Lemma 2.2. *Define*

$$\mathcal{U} = \left\{ \frac{\delta z}{\sqrt{n}} : z \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \|z\|^2 \leq \frac{n}{\delta^2} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T} = \{z \in \mathcal{U} : z \perp \mathbf{1}\},$$

Then

$$\tilde{\lambda}_2 \vee |\tilde{\lambda}_n| \leq 2 \sup_{\substack{v \perp \mathbf{1}, w \\ \|v\|=\|w\|=1}} v^t M w \leq 2(1-\delta)^{-2} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{T}, y \in \mathcal{U}} x^t M y.$$

and

$$|\mathcal{T}| \leq |\mathcal{U}| \leq C \left[\frac{(2+\delta)\sqrt{2e\pi}}{2\delta} \right]^n.$$

Proof. Every v with $\|v\| \leq 1-\delta$ and $v \perp \mathbf{1}$ is a convex combination of points in $\mathcal{T}$ (See Lemma 2.3 of [13]). Likewise, it is easily shown that every w with $\|w\| \leq 1-\delta$ is a convex combination of $\mathcal{U}$. Thus

$$\sup_{\substack{v \perp \mathbf{1}, w \\ \|v\|=\|w\|=1}} |[(1-\delta)v]^t M [(1-\delta)w]| \leq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{T}, y \in \mathcal{U}} x^t M y.$$

Furthermore, by a volume argument, it is possible to bound the cardinality of $\mathcal{U}$ as

$$|\mathcal{U}| \left(\frac{\delta}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^n \leq \text{Vol} \left[x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\| \leq 1 + \delta/2 \right] = \frac{(1 + \delta/2)^n \sqrt{\pi}^n}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2} + 1)}.$$

Employing Stirling's approximation, this shows

$$|\mathcal{U}| \leq C \left[\frac{(2+\delta)\sqrt{2e\pi}}{2\delta} \right]^n.$$

for some universal constant C . □

Next we define some regularity conditions on our graph G which facilitate a large spectral gap. Fix $m \geq 0$, and let $c_*(m) = 18 + 3m$. Further, fix an ϵ with $1/4 \geq \epsilon > 0$, and define $f(d) = c_3 d^{1/4+\epsilon}$ where $c_3 \leq 1$ is a constant to be determined later. In terms of these constants, define the following three regularity conditions.

- (1) **Bounded degree condition (b.d.c)** Every vertex has degree at most $c_* d$.
- (2) **Minimum degree condition (m.d.c)** Every vertex has degree at least

$$\min_u [\deg u] \geq \frac{d^{3/2}}{f(d)^2}.$$

- (3) **Discrepancy** For every pair of vertex sets A and B , letting $e(A, B)$ denote the number of edges between the sets and $\mu(A, B) = \frac{|A||B|d}{n}$, one of

$$(a) \quad \frac{e(A, B)}{\mu(A, B)} \leq ec_*$$

$$(b) \quad e(A, B) \log \frac{e(A, B)}{\mu(A, B)} \leq c_*(|A| \vee |B|) \log \frac{n}{|A| \vee |B|}$$

occurs.

In the $p \gg \log n/n$ regime, all of these criteria hold with overwhelming probability. Of great importance here is verifying each of these conditions with high probability when p is very nearly this threshold. The most difficult of these to satisfy is the **m.d.c.**, which requires $p - \log n/n = \omega(1/n)$. The other two properties are actually satisfied for any $p = \Omega(\log n/n)$ with sufficiently large choice of c_* . Regardless, all of these regularity properties are consequences of tail bounds for binomial random variables.

Lemma 2.3. *Let G be an Erdős-Rényi random graph chosen from $G(n, p)$ where $p \geq \frac{\log n}{n}$. For any $m > 0$ both the **b.d.c** and **discrepancy** properties hold with probability at least $1 - o(n^{-m})$.*

Lemma 2.4. *For all $k > 0$ and $1/4 \geq \epsilon > 0$ there exists $C = C(k, \epsilon)$ such that if G is an Erdős-Rényi random graph with*

$$p \geq \frac{(k+1) \log n + C(\log n)^{1-2\epsilon} \log \log n}{n}$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{m.d.c. fails}) = o(n^{-k}).$$

Following Feige and Ofek we make the following definition.

Definition 2.5. For a fixed pair of vectors $(x, y) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{U}$, define the **light couples** $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(x, y)$ to be all those ordered pairs $(u, v) \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}^2$ so that $|x_u y_v| \leq \frac{f(d)}{n}$, and let the **heavy couples** $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(x, y)$ be all those pairs that are not light.

Using this logical division, we get

$$\sum_{(u,v) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^2} x_u M_{uv} y_v = \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L}} x_u M_{uv} y_v + \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{H}} x_u M_{uv} y_v.$$

If the spectral gap is small then there must be an x and y such that one of the two terms on the right hand side is large. To show this happens with small probability we get a bound on the probability that these sums are large for each fixed pair x and y . After that, we apply the union bound.

First, we get control of the probability that the light couples contribute a large quantity to the sum. The main tool needed to establish this result is Freedman's

martingale inequality. Let $X_1, X_2, \dots$ be martingale increments. Write $\mathcal{F}_k$ for the natural filtration induced by these increments, and define $V_k = \mathbb{E}[X_k^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}]$. If S_n is the partial sum $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ and T_n is the sum $T_n = \sum_{i=1}^n V_i$, then by analogy with the continuous case, one expects S_n to be a Brownian motion at time T_n (a discretization of the bracket process). The analogy requires, however, that the increments have some a priori bound. In its strongest form, put τ to be a stopping time so that for $k \leq \tau$, $|X_k| \leq R$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists n \leq \tau \text{ so that } S_n \geq a \text{ and } T_n \geq b] \leq 2 \exp(-a^2/2(Ra + b)).$$

(see Proposition 2.1 of [15]). With this tool in hand, we form a martingale by revealing edges one at a time and taking conditional expectations of the random variable $\sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L}} x_u M_{uv} y_v$. By virtue of having selected only the light couples, it is possible to bound the increments $|X_k|$ to have the right order.

Lemma 2.6. *There exist constants C_0, C_1 and C_2 so that for every $(x, y) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{U}$, $t \geq 2$ and all n sufficiently large,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\left| \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L}} x_u M_{uv} y_v \right| > \frac{t(1+c_*)f(d)}{\sqrt{d}} \text{ and } \mathbf{b.d.c.} \right] \leq C_0 \exp \left(\frac{-nt^2}{C_1 + C_2 \frac{t}{\sqrt{d}}} \right).$$

To control the heavy couples, it would suffice that with high probability, the edge density between two vertex sets is no more than a constant multiple of its expectation. However, to require this of every pair of vertex sets is too restrictive in the $d \sim \log n$ regime. Instead, we use the **discrepancy** property, which allows larger discrepancies for small vertex sets. The three regularity properties are then used to show that the contribution of the heavy couples can not be too large.

Lemma 2.7. *If the **b.d.c.**, **m.d.c** and **discrepancy** properties all hold then*

$$\sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{H}} |x_u M_{uv} y_v| \leq C \frac{f(d)}{\sqrt{d}},$$

for some constant $C = C(c_*)$.

Finally, by combining these individual bounds, we are able to prove that the spectral gap is large with high probability.

Theorem 2.8. *For all $k > 0$ and $1/4 \geq \epsilon > 0$ there exists $C = C(k, \epsilon)$ so that for all $\eta > 0$,*

$$p \geq \frac{(k+1) \log n + C(\log n)^{1-2\epsilon} \log \log n}{n}$$

then

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\tilde{\lambda}_2 \vee |\tilde{\lambda}_n| \geq \eta d^{-1/4+\epsilon} \right] = o(n^{-k}).$$

Proof. Recall that $f(d) = c_3 d^{1/4+\epsilon}$, where c_3 has yet to be chosen. Fix some $C > 0$ to be determined later. By Lemma 2.2 if

$$\tilde{\lambda}_2 \vee |\tilde{\lambda}_n| \geq \frac{4C}{(1-\delta)^2} \frac{f(d)}{\sqrt{d}}$$

then either there exists $x \in \mathcal{T}$ and $y \in \mathcal{U}$ such that either

$$(3) \quad \left| \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L}} x_u M_{uv} y_v \right| \geq C \frac{f(d)}{\sqrt{d}} \quad \text{or} \quad \left| \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{H}} x_u M_{uv} y_v \right| \geq C \frac{f(d)}{\sqrt{d}}.$$

Let $E_{x,y}$ be the event that

$$\left| \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L}} x_u M_{uv} y_v \right| > C \frac{f(d)}{\sqrt{d}} \text{ and } \mathbf{b.d.c.}$$

By Lemma 2.6 the left hand side of (3) can happen only if $E_{x,y}$ happens for some $(x,y) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{U}$ or if the bounded degree condition fails. By Lemma 2.7 the right hand side of (3) can happen only if at least one of the bounded degree condition, the minimal degree condition or the discrepancy conditions fail. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\tilde{\lambda}_2 \vee |\tilde{\lambda}_n| \geq \frac{4C}{(1-\delta)^2} \cdot \frac{f(d)}{\sqrt{d}} \right) &\leq \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{P}(E_{x,y}) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{m.d.c.}, \mathbf{b.d.c.} \text{ or } \mathbf{discrepancy} \text{ fails}) \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.6 if $C > t(1 + c_*)$ then

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{x,y}) \leq C_0 \exp \left(\frac{-nt^2}{C_1 + C_2 \frac{t}{\sqrt{d}}} \right).$$

We can choose t such that

$$\exp \left(\frac{t^2}{C_1 + C_2 \frac{t}{\sqrt{d}}} \right) > 1000,$$

so that provided that $C > t(1 + c_*)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{x,y}) \leq 1000^{-n}.$$

Applying the regularity Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4 with $m = k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\tilde{\lambda}_2 \vee |\tilde{\lambda}_n| \geq \frac{4C}{(1-\delta)^2} \cdot \frac{f(d)}{\sqrt{d}} \right) &\leq \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{P}(E_{x,y}) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{m.d.c.}, \mathbf{b.d.c.} \text{ or } \mathbf{discrepancy} \text{ fails}) \\ &\leq |\mathcal{T}| |\mathcal{U}| 1000^{-n} + o(n^{-k}) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{9 \cdot 2e\pi}{4\delta^2} \right)^n 1000^{-n} + o(n^{-k}) \\ &\leq o(n^{-k}), \end{aligned}$$

where we pick δ sufficiently large. Thus, choosing c_3 sufficiently small that

$$\frac{4C}{(1-\delta)^2} c_3 < \eta,$$

it has been shown that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\tilde{\lambda}_2 \vee |\tilde{\lambda}_n| \geq \eta d^{-1/4+\epsilon} \right) = o(n^{-k}).$$

□

From this point, it is straightforward to transfer the results about the spectrum of M to statements about the spectral gap of L .

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1. Apply Theorem 2.8 with $\eta = c$, and it follows that there is a constant $C = C(\epsilon, k)$ so that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\tilde{\lambda}_2 \vee |\tilde{\lambda}_n| \geq cd^{-1/4+\epsilon} \right) = o(n^{-k})$$

for

$$p \geq \frac{(k+1) \log n + C(\log n)^{1-2\epsilon} \log \log n}{n}.$$

As the **m.d.c.** held, the graph has an edge except for with probability $o(n^{-k})$, and so the largest eigenvalue of M is exactly 1. The spectrum of L is just one minus the spectrum of M , and so

$$\max_{i \neq 1} |1 - \lambda_i| \leq \tilde{\lambda}_2 \vee |\tilde{\lambda}_n| \leq cd^{-1/4+\epsilon}$$

except for with probability $o(n^{-k})$. □

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3. Apply Theorem 2.1 with $\epsilon = 1/4$, $k = 1$, and $c = 1/2$, and the proof follows. □

2.4. Bounds for the failure probabilities of the regularity conditions.

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.3. For any vertex v , $\deg(v)$ is a binomial random variable with mean $d > \log(n)$. By Lemma A.3

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\deg(v) > c_* d) &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{dc_* \log c_*}{3}\right) \\ &\leq \exp(-\log(n)(1+m) \log c_*) \\ &= o(n^{-1-m}). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the union bound over all vertices, the graph has the bounded degree property with probability $1 - o(n^{-m})$.

We will now turn to showing the discrepancy property.

Let D be the event that the discrepancy condition fails and let $D(A, B)$ be the event that the discrepancy condition fails for sets A and B . Then by the union bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(D) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\exists A, B \text{ with } |A| \wedge |B| \geq n/e : D(A, B) \text{ occurs}) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(\exists A, B \text{ with } |A| \vee |B| \geq n/e \geq |A| \wedge |B| : D(A, B) \text{ occurs}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{A, B: |A| \vee |B| < n/e} \mathbb{P}(D(A, B)) \end{aligned}$$

If $|A| \wedge |B| \geq \frac{n}{e}$, and

$$e(A, B) > c_* \mu(A, B) > c_* (n/e)^2 d/n > nd$$

and there are at least nd edges in the graph. The distribution of the number of edges is binomial with mean $n(n-1)p/2 = nd/2$. The probability of this is going to zero exponentially in $n(n-1)p/2 > n$ and

$$(4) \quad \mathbb{P}(\exists A, B \text{ with } |A| \wedge |B| \geq n/e : D(A, B) \text{ occurs}) = o(n^{-m})$$

If $|A| \vee |B| \geq \frac{n}{e} > |A| \wedge |B|$ and the bounded degree condition fails for some vertex in $A \cup B$ or else $e(A, B) \leq (|A| \vee |B|)c_* d$, so that

$$\frac{e(A, B)}{\mu(A, B)} \leq \frac{c_* nd(|A| \vee |B|)}{|A||B|d} = \frac{c_* n}{|A| \wedge |B|} \leq c_* e.$$

Thus

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\exists A, B \text{ with } |A| \vee |B| \geq n/e \geq |A| \wedge |B| : D(A, B) \text{ occurs}) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\text{b.d.c. fails}) \\ &= o(n^{-m}). \end{aligned}$$

Now we need to deal with the case that both A and B are less than $\frac{n}{e}$. Choose $r = r(A, B, n) = c_* \vee r_1$ where r_1 is the solution to

$$\mu(A, B, n)r_1 \log(r_1) = c_*(|A| \vee |B|) \log \frac{n}{|A| \vee |B|}.$$

For any A, B and n we must have either

- $e(A, B) \leq r\mu(A, B, n)$ and $r = c_*$
- $e(A, B) \leq r\mu(A, B, n)$ and $r = r_1$ or
- $e(A, B) > r\mu(A, B, n)$

Thus if $D(A, B)$ occurs then at least one of the following three events occur.

- $D_1 = D_1(A, B) = \left\{ e(A, B) \leq r\mu(A, B, n), r = c_* \text{ and } e(A, B) > c_*\mu(|A|, |B|, n) \right\}$
- $D_2 = D_2(A, B) = \left\{ e(A, B) \leq r\mu(A, B, n), r = r_1 \text{ and } e(A, B) \log \frac{e(A, B)}{\mu(A, B, n)} > c_*(|A| \vee |B|) \log \frac{n}{|A| \vee |B|} \right\}$
- $D_3 = D_3(A, B) = \{e(A, B) > r\mu(A, B, n)\}$

For D_1 the conditions are mutually exclusive as $e(A, B)$ can not be simultaneously greater than and less than or equal to $c_*\mu(|A|, |B|, n)$. Thus $D_1(A, B)$ is empty. For D_2 we get similar contradiction after a little work.

$$\begin{aligned} e(A, B) \log \frac{e(A, B)}{\mu(A, B, n)} &> c_*(|A| \vee |B|) \log \frac{n}{|A| \vee |B|} \\ e(A, B) \log \frac{e(A, B)}{\mu(A, B, n)} &> \mu(A, B, n)r_1 \log r_1 \\ \frac{e(A, B)}{\mu(A, B, n)} \log \frac{e(A, B)}{\mu(A, B, n)} &> r_1 \log r_1 \\ \frac{e(A, B)}{\mu(A, B, n)} &> r_1 \\ e(A, B) &> r_1\mu(A, B, n) \\ e(A, B) &> r\mu(A, B, n). \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction so $D_2(A, B)$ is also empty.

Now we bound $\mathbb{P}(D_3(A, B))$. We have that $e(A, B)$ is a binomial random variable with mean $\mu = |A| \cdot |B|d/n$. Thus by Lemma A.3

$$\mathbb{P}(e(A, B) > r\mu) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\mu r \log r}{3}\right)$$

for any $r \geq 4$.

$$\mathbb{P}(D_3(A, B)) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\mu(|A|, |B|, n)r \log r}{3}\right)$$

For all A, B we have $D \subset D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3$ and $\mathbb{P}(D_1(A, B)) = \mathbb{P}(D_2(A, B)) = 0$. Combining this with (4) and (5) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(D) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\exists A, B : D(A, B) \text{ occurs}) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\exists A, B : |A|, |B| < n/e \text{ and } D(A, B) \text{ occurs}) + o(n^{-m}) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\exists A, B : |A|, |B| < n/e \text{ and } D_3(A, B) \text{ occurs}) + o(n^{-m}) \\
&\leq \sum_{|A|, |B| \leq n/e} \mathbb{P}(D_3(A, B)) + o(n^{-m}) \\
&\leq \sum_{1 \leq a, b \leq n/e} \sum_{|A|=a, |B|=b} \exp\left(-\frac{\mu r \log r}{3}\right) + o(n^{-m}) \\
&\leq \sum_{1 \leq a, b \leq n/e} \binom{n}{a} \binom{n}{b} \exp\left(-\frac{\mu(a, b, n) r \log r}{3}\right) + o(n^{-m})
\end{aligned}$$

To evaluate the last term we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mu r \log r}{3} &\geq \left(6 + m\right) \left((|A| \vee |B|) \log \frac{n}{|A| \vee |B|} \right) \\
&> \left(2 + 2 + (2 + m)\right) \left((|A| \vee |B|) \log \frac{n}{|A| \vee |B|} \right) \\
&> 2|A|(\log \frac{n}{|A|}) + 2|B|(\log \frac{n}{|B|}) + (2 + m) \log n \\
&> |A|(1 + \log \frac{n}{|A|}) + |B|(1 + \log \frac{n}{|B|}) + (2 + m) \log n.
\end{aligned}$$

The first line is due to the definitions of r and c_* . In the third line we use the monotonicity of $x \log \frac{n}{x}$ on $[1, n/e]$ by substituting in $|A|$, $|B|$ and 1 for x . In the fourth line we use that $|A| \vee |B| \leq \frac{n}{e}$ so $\log \frac{n}{|A|}, \log \frac{n}{|B|} > 1$

Exponentiating we get

$$\exp\left[\frac{\mu r \log r}{3}\right] \geq \left(\frac{en}{|A|}\right)^n \left(\frac{en}{|B|}\right)^n n^{2+m+\alpha},$$

for some $\alpha > 0$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\binom{n}{a} \binom{n}{b} \exp\left(-\frac{\mu(a, b, n) r \log r}{3}\right) &\leq \binom{n}{a} \binom{n}{b} \left(\frac{en}{a}\right)^{-n} \left(\frac{en}{b}\right)^{-n} n^{-2-m-\alpha} \\
&\leq n^{-2-m-\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting this together we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(D) &\leq \sum_{1 \leq a, b \leq n/e} \binom{n}{a} \binom{n}{b} \exp\left(-\frac{\mu(a, b, n) r \log r}{3}\right) + o(n^{-m}) \\
&\leq n^2 n^{-2-m-\alpha} + o(n^{-m}) \\
&= o(n^{-m})
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the lemma is satisfied. $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.4. First we set

$$t = \frac{d^{3/2}}{f(d)^2} = \frac{d^{1-2\epsilon}}{(c_3)^2}.$$

Then, we apply the union bound, so

$$\mathbb{P}[\text{m.d.c. fails}] \leq n \mathbb{P}[\deg(v) \leq t].$$

The distribution of $\deg(v)$ is a binomial distribution with mean d . As $\epsilon > 0$ and hence $t < d$ for n sufficiently large, it is possible to apply Lemma A.2

$$\mathbb{P}[\deg(v) \leq t] \leq \exp(-d + t(1 + \log \frac{d}{t})).$$

Applying this inequality and taking logs we get

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{m.d.c.} \text{ fails}] &\leq \log n - d + t \left[1 + \log \frac{d}{t}\right] \\ &\leq \log n - d + \frac{d^{1-2\epsilon}}{(c_3)^2} [1 + \log((c_3)^2 d^{2\epsilon})]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for $d > 1$, this bound is monotone decreasing in d . Thus we get an upper bound on this quantity by assuming that d is as small as possible, which means

$$d = (k+1) \log n + C(\log n)^{1-2\epsilon} \log \log n.$$

As $\epsilon > 0$ this implies that

$$d < C' \log n \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{c_3^2} [1 + \log((c_3)^2 d^{2\epsilon})] \leq (C')^{2\epsilon} \log \log n$$

for $C' = k+2$ and all n sufficiently large.

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{m.d.c.} \text{ fails}] &\leq -k \log n - C(\log n)^{1-2\epsilon} \log \log n + [C' \log n]^{1-2\epsilon} ((C')^{2\epsilon} \log \log n) \\ &\leq -k \log n - C(\log n)^{1-2\epsilon} \log \log n + C'(\log n)^{1-2\epsilon} (\log \log n) \\ &\leq -k \log n - (C - C')(\log n)^{1-2\epsilon} \log \log n \\ &\leq -k \log n - \omega(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last line is true for all $C > C'$. Thus

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{m.d.c.} \text{ fails}] = o(n^{-k}).$$

□

2.5. Light Couple Bounds. To get tail bounds on the contributions of the light couples we first bound their expectation, and then we prove a large deviation result.

Lemma 2.9. *The expectation over the light couples is at most $1/f(d)(1 + o(1))$. More precisely,*

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L}} x_u M_{uv} y_v \right| \leq \frac{1}{n-1} + \left[1 + \frac{1}{n-1}\right] \frac{1}{f(d)}.$$

Proof. By symmetry, $\mathbb{E} M_{uv}$ is independent of u and v provided that $u \neq v$. When $u = v$, $M_{uv} \equiv 0$. Define $E = \mathbb{E} M_{uv}$ and define $\mathcal{D} = \{(u, u) : u \in 1, \dots, n\}$ so that

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L}} x_u M_{uv} y_v = E \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{D}} x_u y_v.$$

Because x_u sums to 0, the sum over all light couple contributions $x_u y_v$ can be related to the sum over all heavy couple contributions. Specifically,

$$0 = \sum_{(u,v) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^2} x_u y_v = \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{D}} x_u y_v + \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{D}} x_u y_v + \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{D}} x_u y_v,$$

and thus

$$\left| \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{D}} x_u y_v \right| \leq \left| \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{D}} x_u y_v \right| + \left| \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{D}} x_u y_v \right|.$$

The sum over the diagonal $\mathcal{D}$ is simply the dot product of these vectors and is thus bounded as

$$(6) \quad \left| \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{D}} x_u y_v \right| = |x \cdot y| \leq \|x\| \|y\| \leq 1,$$

where we recall that both $\|x\|, \|y\| \leq 1$. The contribution of the heavy couples can be bounded as well

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{D}} x_u y_v \right| &\leq \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \mathcal{H}} |x_u y_v| \\ &= \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{x_u^2 y_v^2}{|x_u y_v|} \\ &\leq \frac{n}{f(d)} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \mathcal{H}} x_u^2 y_v^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the defining property of heavy couples, and thus we have shown

$$(7) \quad \left| \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{D}} x_u y_v \right| \leq \frac{n}{f(d)}.$$

Combine both bounds (6) and (7), and it is possible to bound the contribution of the nondiagonal light couples by

$$(8) \quad \left| \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{D}} x_u y_v \right| \leq 1 + \frac{n}{f(d)}.$$

It remains to establish an upper bound for E to complete the proof. Recall that E can be given by

$$E = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v}}{\sqrt{\deg u} \sqrt{\deg v}} \right]$$

for any fixed distinct vertices u and v . Let $\deg \hat{u} = \deg u - \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v}$ and define $\deg \hat{v}$ analogously. Then $\deg \hat{u}$ and $\deg \hat{v}$ and $(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\deg \hat{u} + 1}}$ and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\deg \hat{v} + 1}})$ are independent. Computing E ,

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} = 1) \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v}}{\sqrt{\deg u} \sqrt{\deg v}} \mid \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} = 1 \right] \\ &= p \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\deg \hat{u} + 1} \sqrt{\deg \hat{v} + 1}} \right] \\ &= p \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\deg \hat{u} + 1}} \right] \right)^2 \\ &\leq p \frac{1}{p(n-1)} = \frac{p}{d}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step, Lemma A.1 has been applied, noting $\deg \tilde{u} \sim \text{Binomial}(n-1, p)$. Combining this with (8) we get

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \mathcal{L}} x_u M_{uv} y_v \right| \leq \frac{p}{d} \left[1 + \frac{n}{f(d)} \right] \leq \frac{1}{n-1} + \left(1 + \frac{1}{n-1} \right) \frac{1}{f(d)}.$$

Note that $f(d) \leq \sqrt{d} \leq \sqrt{n-1}$, and thus the additive error term is of a much smaller order than the $\frac{1}{f(d)}$ contribution. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.6. In executing the concentration of measure inequality, it is helpful if instead of proving the inequality for the sum

$$\sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L}} x_u M_{uv} y_v,$$

we partition this sum into smaller pieces. It is possible to partition the vertices into two ways, $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^4$ and $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^4$, so that each block has cardinality at most $\lceil n/3 \rceil$ and so that x_u has constant sign over each block of $\{U_i\}$ (and likewise y_v has constant sign over each block of $\{V_i\}$).

The large deviation inequality we will establish will bound

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\left| \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L} \cap U_i \times V_j} x_u M_{uv} y_v - \mathbb{E} x_u M_{uv} y_v \right| > \frac{t(2+c_*)f(d)}{\sqrt{d}} \text{ and b.d.c.} \right]$$

for all $n > n_0(t)$. Having established the inequality for every pair of $\{U_i\}$ and $\{V_j\}$, a similar bound can be established for the full sum by applying the union bound and adjusting the constants in the bound.

Note that because $|U_i|, |V_j| \leq \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil = r$, there are at least $\frac{n}{4}$ vertices not included in these lists (for $n \geq n_0$ universal). Call this set of vertices $\mathcal{A}$. Assume for the following that all x_u and all y_v are non-negative. Other possibilities can be handled in an identical manner. Enumerate the distinct edges between U_i and V_j as $e_1, e_2, \dots$, and note there are at most r^2 such edges. Form the edge-revelation filtration, so that $\mathcal{F}_k = \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \vee \sigma(e_k)$. According to this filtration, let

$$S_k = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{(u,v) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}} x_u M_{uv} y_v \middle| \mathcal{F}_k \right]$$

define a martingale, where $\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{L} \cap U_i \times V_j$ and let X_k be the associated martingale increments. Let τ be the stopping time defined by

$$\tau = \inf \left\{ k : \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathbb{E} [\deg u_i \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \geq (1 + c_*)d \right\}.$$

If the bounded degree condition is satisfied, then $\deg u_i \leq c_* d$ for all i , and so

$$\text{b.d.c.} \implies \mathbb{E} [\deg u_i \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq (1 + c_*)d \quad \forall 0 \leq k \leq n.$$

Especially, the bounded degree condition implies $\tau = \infty$.

The desired large deviation bound can now be cast in terms of S_k and τ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[\left| \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \mathcal{L} \cap U_i \times V_j} x_u M_{uv} y_v - \mathbb{E} x_u M_{uv} y_v \right| > t \text{ and b.d.c.} \right] \\ \leq \mathbb{P} [\exists k \leq \tau \text{ so that } |S_k - S_0| \geq t \text{ and } T_n \geq b] \\ \leq 2 \exp \left(\frac{-t^2}{2(Rt + b)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

provided that b satisfies

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\tau} \mathbb{E} [X_k^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq b$$

and R satisfies $|X_k| \leq R$ for $k \leq \tau$.

This reduces the proof to finding suitable choices of R and b . The starting point for computing either value is the expression for X_k , with $e_k = \{u, v\}$, given by

$$(9) \quad X_k = \mathbf{1}_{(u,v) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}} [D(u, v) + L(u, v) + U(u, v)] + \mathbf{1}_{(v,u) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}} [D(v, u) + L(v, u) + U(v, u)]$$

where D, L and U are each handled separately.

2.5.1. Bounding $D(u, v)$.

$$D(u, v) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{x_u \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} y_v}{\sqrt{\deg u} \sqrt{\deg v}} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{x_u \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} y_v}{\sqrt{\deg u} \sqrt{\deg v}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right].$$

This can be simplified substantially. Let $\deg \hat{u} = \deg u - \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v}$ and let $\deg \hat{v} = \deg v - \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v}$. The second term vanishes unless $\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} = 1$, so that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{x_u \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} y_v}{\sqrt{\deg u} \sqrt{\deg v}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{p x_u y_v}{\sqrt{\deg \hat{u} + 1} \sqrt{\deg \hat{v} + 1}} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right].$$

Substituting this into the definition of $D(u, v)$, it is seen that

$$|D(u, v)| \leq x_u y_v |\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} - p| \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\deg \hat{u} + 1} \sqrt{\deg \hat{v} + 1}} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right].$$

These two degrees, $\deg \hat{u}$ and $\deg \hat{v}$ are conditionally independent. Moreover, they can be bounded below by $\deg \hat{u} \geq \deg(u, \mathcal{A})$ and $\deg \hat{v} \geq \deg(v, \mathcal{A})$, both of which are mutually independent of one another and of $\mathcal{F}_k$. From this it follows that

$$(10) \quad |D(u, v)| \leq x_u y_v |\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} - p| \frac{4}{d},$$

where Lemma A.1 and $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \frac{n}{4}$ has been used.

2.5.2. Bounding $L(u, v)$.

$$L(u, v) = \sum_{\substack{w \neq v \\ (u,w) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}} x_u y_w \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w}}{\sqrt{\deg u} \sqrt{\deg w}} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w}}{\sqrt{\deg u} \sqrt{\deg w}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right].$$

As before, let $\deg \hat{u} = \deg u - \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v}$. Let $\chi \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p)$ be independent of the entire graph. The second conditional expectation may be rewritten as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w}}{\sqrt{\deg u} \sqrt{\deg w}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w}}{\sqrt{\deg \hat{u} + \chi} \sqrt{\deg w}} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right].$$

In this alternate form, the two conditional expectations may be joined and a common denominator formed to yield a single expression

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w}(\chi - \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v})}{\sqrt{\deg u} \sqrt{\deg w} \sqrt{\deg \hat{u} + \chi} (\sqrt{\deg u} + \sqrt{\deg \hat{u} + \chi})} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right].$$

The bound for this quantity depends entirely on whether $\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w}$ is $\mathcal{F}_k$ measurable or not. If it is not measurable, however, then we will condition on it to advance the calculation anyhow. Consider bounding

$$(11) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w}(\chi - \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v})}{\sqrt{\deg u} \sqrt{\deg w} \sqrt{\deg \hat{u} + \chi} (\sqrt{\deg u} + \sqrt{\deg \hat{u} + \chi})} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \vee \sigma(\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w}) \right].$$

To bound this from above, bound each of the degree expressions in the denominator from below by either $X_u = \deg(u, \mathcal{A})$ or $X_w = \deg(w, \mathcal{A})$. Using these bounds, expression (11) can be bounded from above by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w} \chi}{2\sqrt{1+X_u}^3 \sqrt{1+X_w}} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \vee \sigma(\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w}) \right] \leq \frac{8p\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w}}{d^2}.$$

To bound (11) from below, drop the χ from the numerator. This makes the expression nonpositive, so the analogous bound

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{-\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w} \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v}}{2\sqrt{1+X_u}^3 \sqrt{1+X_w}} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \vee \sigma(\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w}) \right] \geq \frac{-8\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w}}{d^2}$$

holds. Combining each of these bounds, it follows that $L(u, v)$ can be bounded by

$$(12) \quad \sum_{\substack{w \neq v \\ (u, w) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}} -8\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} x_u y_w \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w} \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq L(u, v) d^2 \leq \sum_{\substack{w \neq v \\ (u, w) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}} 8p x_u y_w \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w} \mid \mathcal{F}_k].$$

2.5.3. *Bounding $U(u, v)$.*

$$U(u, v) = \sum_{\substack{w \neq u \\ (w, v) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}} x_w y_v \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}_{w \leftrightarrow v}}{\sqrt{\deg w} \sqrt{\deg v}} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}_{w \leftrightarrow v}}{\sqrt{\deg w} \sqrt{\deg v}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right].$$

Note the symmetry with $L(u, v)$. The same proof technique shows that

$$\sum_{\substack{w \neq u \\ (w, u) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}} -8\mathbf{1}_{w \leftrightarrow v} x_w y_v \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{w \leftrightarrow v} \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq U(u, v) d^2 \leq \sum_{\substack{w \neq v \\ (w, v) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}} 8p x_w y_v \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{w \leftrightarrow v} \mid \mathcal{F}_k].$$

2.5.4. *Bounding $|X_k|$, $k \leq \tau$.* Recall that X_k is given by (9). The triangle inequality will be applied and each term bounded separately. Recall that only pairs $(u, v) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ contribute to X_k , and thus $x_u y_v \leq \frac{f(d)}{n}$. With these preliminaries in mind, the simplest bound is of D , for which

$$|D(u, v)| \leq x_u y_v |\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} - p| \frac{4}{d} \leq \frac{4f(d)}{nd}.$$

For the bound on L , recall the bound in (12), use $x_u y_v \leq \frac{f(d)}{n}$ and use $k \leq \tau$:

$$|L(u, v)| \leq \sum_{\substack{w \neq v \\ (u, w) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}} \frac{8x_u y_w \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w} \mid \mathcal{F}_k]}{d^2} \leq \frac{8f(d)(1+c_*)d}{nd^2} = \frac{8(1+c_*)f(d)}{nd}.$$

The bound on U is identical, and all bounds may be combined to give

$$|X_k| \leq \frac{(40 + 32c_*)f(d)}{nd}, \quad k \leq \tau.$$

2.5.5. *Bounding $\sum_{k=1}^{\tau} \mathbb{E}[X_k^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}]$.* Again, each of D , L and U will be handled separately, and the bound applied to $\mathbb{E}[X_k^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}]$ by virtue of convexity, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}[X_k^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq 6 [\mathbb{E}[D(u, v)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] + \mathbb{E}[L(u, v)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] + \dots].$$

The contribution of $\mathbb{E}[D(u, v)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}]$ is bounded using (10) as

$$\mathbb{E}[D(u, v)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{16x_u^2 y_v^2}{d^2} |\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} - p|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\right] \leq \frac{32px_u^2 y_v^2}{d^2}.$$

Summing over all of these bounds,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\tau} \mathbb{E}[D(u, v)^2 + D(v, u)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq \sum_{u, v} \frac{32px_u^2 y_v^2}{d^2} \leq \frac{32}{nd},$$

where $\{u, v\} = e_k$ and where it has been used that $\|x\|, \|y\| \leq 1$.

The contribution of L requires the bounds (12) to be simplified somewhat. Symmetrizing the bound (12),

$$|L(u, v)| \leq \sum_{\substack{w \neq v \\ (u, w) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}} \frac{8x_u(\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} \vee p)y_w \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w} \mid \mathcal{F}_k]}{d^2}.$$

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the random, $\mathcal{F}_k$ -measurable set of light edges emanating from u that are in the history of the process, i.e.

$$\mathcal{S} = \left\{ w \neq v \mid 1 = \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow w} \in \mathcal{F}_k, (u, w) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}} \right\}.$$

In terms of this random set,

$$|L(u, v)| \leq \frac{8(\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} \vee p)}{d^2} \left[\sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}} x_u y_w + \sum_{w \notin \mathcal{S}, w \neq v} x_u p y_w \right].$$

Thus provided τ has not happened yet, $|\mathcal{S}| \leq (1 + c_*)d$, which produces the bound

$$|L(u, v)| \leq \frac{8(\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} \vee p)}{d^2} \left[\frac{f(d)}{n} (1 + c_*)d + \frac{f(d)}{n} (n - 1)p \right] \leq \frac{8(\mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} \vee p)(2 + c_*)f(d)}{nd}.$$

Thus, the contribution of $\mathbb{E}[L(u, v)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}]$ to the sum of variances can be bounded by

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\tau} \mathbb{E}[L(u, v)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq \sum_{k=1}^{n^2} \frac{128p(2 + c_*)^2 f(d)^2}{n^2 d^2} \leq \frac{128(2 + c_*)^2 f(d)^2}{nd}.$$

The bounds for the contributions of $L(v, u)$, $U(u, v)$, and $U(v, u)$ are all identical, so that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\tau} \mathbb{E}[X_k^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq \frac{192}{nd} + \frac{3072(2 + c_*)^2 f(d)^2}{nd} \leq \frac{3200(2 + c_*)^2 f(d)^2}{nd}.$$

2.5.6. *Assembling the tail bound.* Having determined bounds for R and b in the Freedman bound:

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists k \leq \tau \text{ so that } |S_k - S_0| \geq t \text{ and } T_n \geq b] \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{-t^2}{2(Rt + b)}\right).$$

We make the scale change $t = \lambda(2 + c_*) \frac{f(d)}{\sqrt{d}}$ so that this bound becomes

$$2 \exp\left(\frac{-n\lambda^2}{6400 + 64 \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{d}}}\right).$$

It remains to establish the bound for the entire contribution of the light couples. Letting $Q_1, \dots, Q_{16}$ enumerate each of

$$\left| \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L} \cap U_i \times V_j} x_u M_{uv} y_v - \mathbb{E} x_u M_{uv} y_v \right|$$

over all possible pairs (i, j) . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[Q_1 + \dots + Q_{16} > \frac{16t(2+c_*)f(d)}{\sqrt{d}} \text{ and } b.d.c\right] &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\max Q_i > \frac{t(2+c_*)f(d)}{\sqrt{d}}\right] \\ &\leq 32 \exp\left(\frac{-nt^2}{6400 + 64 \frac{t}{\sqrt{d}}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to include the contribution of the expectation into this inequality. With $f(d) \rightarrow \infty$, the expectation is of smaller order than the bound, and so can be ignored almost completely. To be absolutely correct, though, we have that by Lemma 2.9

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L}} x_u M_{uv} y_v \right| \leq \frac{1}{n-1} + \left[1 + \frac{1}{n-1}\right] \frac{1}{f(d)} \leq 2 \frac{f(d)}{\sqrt{d}},$$

for n sufficiently large, so that

$$\left| \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L}} x_u [M_{uv} - \mathbb{E} M_{u,v}] y_v \right| > \frac{t(2+c_*)f(d)}{\sqrt{d}}$$

implies

$$\left| \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{L}} x_u M_{uv} y_v \right| > \frac{t(1+c_*)f(d)}{\sqrt{d}},$$

for $t \geq 2$. □

2.6. Controlling the contribution of the heavy couples. PROOF OF LEMMA 2.7.

The method of proof here is similar to [13] and [17]. As we have modified the setup slightly from their proofs, we provide a proof of this lemma for completeness. We start by reducing the claim to a claim about the adjacency matrix, by employing the **m.d.c.** Specifically, provided that the **m.d.c.** holds,

$$\sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{H}} |x_u M_{u,v} y_v| \leq \frac{1}{\min_u \deg(u)} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{H}} |x_u \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} y_v| \leq \frac{f(d)^2}{d^{3/2}} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{H}} |x_u \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} y_v|.$$

Thus, it suffices to show that there is a constant $C = C(c_*, c_*, c_*)$ so that

$$\sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{H}} |x_u \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} y_v| \leq C \frac{d}{f(d)}.$$

In the remainder of the proof, we assume that **b.d.c.**, **m.d.c.** and **discrepancy** all hold, and we show how to produce this constant.

We will partition the summands into blocks where each term x_u or y_v has approximately the same magnitude. Thus let $\gamma_i = 2^i \delta$, and put

$$\begin{aligned} A_i &= \left\{ u \mid \frac{\gamma_{i-1}}{\sqrt{n}} \leq |x_u| < \frac{\gamma_i}{\sqrt{n}} \right\}, & 1 \leq i \leq \log \lceil \sqrt{n}/\delta \rceil. \\ B_i &= \left\{ u \mid \frac{\gamma_{i-1}}{\sqrt{n}} \leq |y_u| < \frac{\gamma_i}{\sqrt{n}} \right\}, & 1 \leq i \leq \log \lceil \sqrt{n}/\delta \rceil. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ denote those pairs (i, j) so that $\gamma_i \gamma_j \geq f(d)$. The contribution of the absolute sum can, in these terms, be bounded by

$$\sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{H}} |x_u \mathbf{1}_{u \leftrightarrow v} y_v| \leq \sum_{(i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}} \frac{\gamma_i \gamma_j}{n} e(A_i, B_j).$$

Let $\lambda_{i,j} = \frac{e(A_i, B_j)}{\mu(A_i, B_j)}$ denote the discrepancy, which can be controlled using Lemma 2.3. In terms of this quantity, the bound becomes

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}} \frac{\gamma_i \gamma_j}{n} \lambda_{i,j} |A_i| |B_j| \frac{d}{n}.$$

In this form, the magnitudes of each of the quantities are somewhat opaque. Consider the sum $\sum_i |A_i| \frac{\gamma_i^2}{n}$; it is at most $4\|x\|^2$. In particular, it is of constant order.

Thus let $\alpha_i = |A_i| \frac{\gamma_i^2}{n}$ and $\beta_j = |B_j| \frac{\gamma_j^2}{n}$. This allows the bound to be rewritten as

$$d \sum_{(i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}} \frac{\gamma_i^2 |A_i|}{n} \frac{\gamma_j^2 |B_j|}{n} \frac{\lambda_{i,j}}{\gamma_i \gamma_j} = \frac{d}{f(d)} \sum_{(i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}} \alpha_i \beta_j \frac{\lambda_{i,j} f(d)}{\gamma_i \gamma_j}.$$

This exposes the quantity $\sigma_{i,j} = \frac{\lambda_{i,j} f(d)}{\gamma_i \gamma_j}$ as having some special importance. In effect, either for fixed j , $\sum_j \sigma_{i,j} \beta_j$ has constant order or for fixed i , $\sum_i \sigma_{i,j} \alpha_i$ has constant order.

In what follows, we will bound the contribution of the summands where $|A_i| \geq |B_j|$. By symmetry, the contribution of the other summands will have the same bound. The heavy couples will now be partitioned into 6 classes $\{\hat{\mathcal{H}}_i\}_{i=1}^6$ where their contribution is bounded in a different way. Let $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_i \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{H}}$ be those pairs (i, j) which satisfy the i^{th} property from the following list but none of the prior properties:

- (1) $\sigma_{i,j} \leq 1$.
- (2) $\lambda_{i,j} \leq e c_*$.
- (3) $\gamma_j > f(d) \gamma_i$.
- (4) $\log \lambda_{i,j} > \frac{1}{4} \left[2 \log \gamma_i + \log \frac{1}{\alpha_i} \right]$.
- (5) $2 \log \gamma_i \geq \log \frac{1}{\alpha_i}$.
- (6) $2 \log \gamma_i < \log \frac{1}{\alpha_i}$.

The last properties are better understood when the second case of the discrepancy property is expressed in present notation. In its original form, it states

$$e(A_i, B_j) \log \lambda_{i,j} \leq c_* |A_i| \log \frac{n}{|A_i|}.$$

Substituting γ_i^2/α_i for $n/|A_i|$ and multiplying both sides of this equation through by $\frac{\gamma_i f(d)}{|B_j| \gamma_j d \log \lambda_{i,j}}$ produces the equivalent form

$$\sigma_{i,j} \beta_j \leq c_* \frac{f(d) \gamma_j}{d \gamma_i} \frac{\left[2 \log \gamma_i + \log \frac{1}{\alpha_i} \right]}{\log \lambda_{i,j}}.$$

Thus, the last 3 cases cover each of the possible dominant log terms in this bound.

2.6.1. *Bounding the contribution of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$.* Quite trivially,

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_1} \alpha_i \beta_j \sigma_{i,j} \leq \left(\sum_i \alpha_i \right) \left(\sum_j \beta_j \right) \leq 16.$$

2.6.2. *Bounding the contribution of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$.* All the discrepancies in this sum are uniformly bounded. As $\gamma_i \gamma_j \geq f(d)$, it follows that $\sigma_{i,j} \leq ec_*$ and

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_2} \alpha_i \beta_j \sigma_{i,j} \leq 16ec_*.$$

2.6.3. *Bounding the contribution of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$.* In this case, the magnitudes of y_v dominate those of x_u . However, by bounded degree, there can not be very many edges connecting to y_v that actualize this contribution, i.e. $e(A_i, B_j) \leq |B_j| c_* d$, so that the discrepancy $\lambda_{i,j}$ is at most $\frac{c_* n}{|A_i|} = \frac{c_* \gamma_i^2}{\alpha_i}$. Fixing a j ,

$$\sum_{i : (i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_3} \alpha_i \beta_j \sigma_{i,j} = \sum_{i : (i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_3} \alpha_i \beta_j \frac{\lambda_{i,j} f(d)}{\gamma_i \gamma_j} \leq \sum_{i : (i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_3} \beta_j \frac{c_* \gamma_i f(d)}{\gamma_j} \leq 2c_* \beta_j,$$

where in the last step it has been used that the sum is geometric with leading term less than $\gamma_j/f(d)$. Summing over all β_j shows that

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_3} \alpha_i \beta_j \sigma_{i,j} \leq \sum_{j : (i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_3} 2c_* \beta_j \leq 8c_*.$$

2.6.4. *Bounding the contribution of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$.* We are not in case (2), and it follows that the second case of the discrepancy property holds. In present notation

$$\sigma_{i,j} \beta_j \leq c_* \frac{f(d) \gamma_j}{d \gamma_i} \frac{\left[2 \log \gamma_i + \log \frac{1}{\alpha_i} \right]}{\log \lambda_{i,j}} \leq \frac{4c_* \gamma_j}{\gamma_i f(d)},$$

where $f(d) \leq \sqrt{d}$ and the hypothesis has been used. As we are not in case (3), the sum of these terms is bounded as

$$\sum_{j : (i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_4} \alpha_i \beta_j \sigma_{i,j} \leq \alpha_i 8c_*,$$

where it has been used that the sum has a geometric dominator with leading term at most $\gamma_i f(d)$. Summing over all the i ,

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_4} \alpha_i \beta_j \sigma_{i,j} \leq \sum_{i : (i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_4} \alpha_i 8c_* \leq 32c_*.$$

2.6.5. *Bounding the contribution of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$.* Again, the second case of the discrepancy property holds. Now, in addition,

$$\log \lambda_{i,j} \leq \frac{1}{4} \left[2 \log \gamma_i + \log \frac{1}{\alpha_i} \right] \leq \log \gamma_i,$$

i.e. that $\lambda_{i,j} \leq \gamma_i$. Furthermore, we are not in case (1) so $1 \leq \sigma_{i,j} = \frac{\lambda_{i,j} f(d)}{\gamma_i \gamma_j} \leq \frac{f(d)}{\gamma_j}$. Thus the second discrepancy bound becomes

$$\sigma_{i,j} \beta_j \leq c_* \frac{f(d) \gamma_j}{d \gamma_i} \frac{\left[2 \log \gamma_i + \log \frac{1}{\alpha_i} \right]}{\log \lambda_{i,j}} \leq c_* \frac{\gamma_j 4 \log \gamma_i}{f(d) \gamma_i (1 + \log c_*)} \leq \frac{4c_*}{1 + \log c_*} \frac{\gamma_j}{f(d)},$$

where it has been used that $\lambda_{i,j} \geq ec_*$. Fixing an i and summing over j ,

$$\sum_{j : (i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_5} \alpha_i \beta_j \sigma_{i,j} \leq \alpha_i \sum_{j : (i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_5} \frac{4c_*}{1 + \log c_*} \frac{\gamma_j}{f(d)} \leq \alpha_i \frac{8c_*}{1 + \log c_*},$$

where it has been used that the sum is geometric with largest term $f(d)$. Summing over all i ,

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_5} \alpha_i \beta_j \sigma_{i,j} \leq \sum_{i : (i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_5} \alpha_i \frac{8c_*}{1 + \log c_*} \leq \frac{32c_*}{(1 + \log c_*)}.$$

2.6.6. *Bounding the contribution of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$.* The second case of the discrepancy property holds and in addition,

$$\log \lambda_{i,j} \leq \frac{1}{4} \left[2 \log \gamma_i + \log \frac{1}{\alpha_i} \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1}{\alpha_i}.$$

This implies that σ satisfies the asymmetric bound $\sigma_{i,j} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha_i} \frac{f(d)}{\gamma_i \gamma_j}$. Thus fixing a j ,

$$\sum_{i : (i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_6} \alpha_i \beta_j \sigma_{i,j} \leq \sum_{i : (i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_6} \beta_j \frac{f(d)}{\gamma_i \gamma_j} \leq 2\beta_j,$$

where it has been used that the sum is geometric with leading term $\frac{1}{f(d)}$ (which follows as $\gamma_i \gamma_j \geq f(d)$). At last, summing over all the i ,

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_6} \alpha_i \beta_j \sigma_{i,j} \leq \sum_{j : (i,j) \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_6} 2\beta_j \leq 8.$$

2.6.7. *Combining the bounds.* By summing all of the bounds, we can take C to be

$$C = 16 + 16ec_* + 8c_* + 32c_* + \frac{32c_*}{1 + \log c_*}.$$

□

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

We now have everything in place to prove the main result.

3.1. Part (1) of Theorem 1.2. We check that if p is sufficiently small,

$$p = \frac{2 \log n - \omega}{n},$$

and $Y \in Y(n, p)$ then $\pi_1(Y)$ a.a.s. does not have property (T).

As observed earlier by Linial and Meshulam [25], if $p = \frac{2 \log n - \omega}{n}$ and $Y \in Y(n, p)$ then a.a.s. there are edges which are not contained in any 2-dimensional face. This is their proof that in this case $H_1(Y, \mathbb{Z}/2) \neq 0$, but the same argument shows that $H_1(Y, \mathbb{Q}) \neq 0$. Then it follows immediately that $\pi_1(Y)$ does not have property (T), since finitely generated (T) groups have finite abelianization [5].

3.2. Part (2) of Theorem 1.2. We wish to show that if p is sufficiently large, namely that

$$p \geq \frac{2 \log n + \omega \sqrt{\log n \log \log n}}{n},$$

where $\omega \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and $Y \in Y(n, p)$ then $\pi(Y)$ has property (T) a.a.s.

To apply Żuk's Theorem 1.1, we need to show that Y is pure 2-dimensional, every vertex link is connected, and that every vertex link has spectral gap at least $1/2$.

Linial and Meshulam showed that that if

$$p \geq \frac{2 \log n + \omega}{n},$$

and $Y \in Y(n, p)$ then a.a.s. $H_1(Y, \mathbb{Z}/2) = 0$ [25]. As they observed, this already implies that Y is pure 2-dimensional, since any edge not contained in a triangle would itself represent a nontrivial cocycle in cohomology with $\mathbb{Z}/2$ coefficients.

If $H_1(Y, \mathbb{Z}/2) = 0$, it also follows that every vertex link of Y is connected as follows. Let $a, b, c \in [n]$ be an arbitrary triple of distinct vertices in Y . By Linial and Meshulam's result, cycle abc is the boundary of some 2-chain $\alpha \in C_2$. Intersecting α with $\text{lk}_a(Y)$ gives a graph that is even-degree everywhere, except odd-degree at b and c . It follows that b and c are in the same connected component of $\text{lk}_a(X)$. Since the choice of a, b, c was arbitrary, every vertex link is connected.

Finally, we need to check that a.a.s. every vertex link has spectral gap $\geq 1/2$. Every vertex link is an Erdős-Rényi random graph $G(n-1, p)$ so Theorem 1.3 with $k = 1$ gives that the probability that any particular vertex link fails to have sufficiently large spectral gap is $o(1/n)$. Applying a union bound over the n vertices, the probability that at least one vertex link fails to have large spectral gap is $o(1)$. The desired result follows.

4. REMARKS

Our main theorem parallels earlier results of Żuk, Theorem 4 of [35], which provided examples of hyperbolic groups with Property (T) for density $1/3 < d < 1/2$ [28]. Combining with [2], the results here also give random examples of hyperbolic groups with Property (T), for $\pi_1(Y)$ with $Y \in Y(n, p)$ and

$$\frac{2 \log n}{n} \ll p \ll n^{-1/2}.$$

In proving Żuk was able to make use of earlier results on spectral gap of random d -regular graphs due to Friedman [18]. Coja-Oghlan has a result (Theorem 1.2 in [10])

analogous to our Theorem 1.3, but requires p to be slightly larger $p \geq C \log n/n$ for some sufficiently large constant C .

We can not rule out the possibility that (2) of Theorem 1.2 can be improved to say that

$$p \geq \frac{2 \log n + \omega}{n}$$

is sufficient to imply that $Y \in Y(n, p)$ has property (T) a.a.s., as Linial and Meshulam proved is sufficient to imply that $H_1(Y, \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0$ a.a.s. To prove this using Žuk's Theorem 1.1, however, would require even stronger results on concentration of spectral gap of Erdős-Rényi random graphs.

A. ESTIMATES OF BINOMIAL RANDOM VARIABLES

Lemma A.1. *Let $X \sim \text{Binomial}(n, p)$, then it follows that*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{np+1}} \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+X}} \right] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{p(n+1)}}.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA A.1. The lower bound follows as an immediate consequence of Jensen's inequality. For the upper bound, applying Jensen gives that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+X}} \right] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{1+X} \right]}.$$

The proof will be completed by verifying the identity

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{X+1} \right] = \frac{1}{p(n+1)} (1 - (1-p)^{n+1}),$$

from which the claim follows immediately.

Expand the expectation as a sum

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{X+1} \right] = \sum_{i=0}^n \frac{1}{1+i} \binom{n}{i} p^i (1-p)^{n-i}$$

Apply the binomial coefficient identity $\frac{1}{i+1} \binom{n}{i} = \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{n+1}{i+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{i=0}^n \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{n+1}{i+1} p^i (1-p)^{n-i} \\ &= \frac{1}{p(n+1)} \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n+1}{i+1} p^{i+1} (1-p)^{(n+1)-(i+1)} \\ &= \frac{1}{p(n+1)} (1 - (1-p)^{n+1}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from comparison with the binomial theorem. $\square$

Lemma A.2. *Let X be a binomial random variable with mean μ . Then for any $t \leq \mu$*

$$\mathbb{P}[X \leq t] \leq \exp \left[-\mu + t(1 + \log \frac{\mu}{t}) \right],$$

PROOF OF LEMMA A.2. The proof follows from a standard estimate on the Laplace transform combined with Markov's inequality. For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, the Laplace transform of $X \sim \text{Binomial}(n, p)$ can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda X} &= (pe^\lambda + (1-p))^n \\ &= (1 + p(e^\lambda - 1))^n \\ &\leq \exp[\mu(e^\lambda - 1)].\end{aligned}$$

Provided that $\lambda < 0$, the tail bound now can be bounded by Markov's inequality by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}[X \leq t] &= \mathbb{P}[e^{\lambda X} \geq e^{\lambda t}] \\ &\leq [\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda X}] e^{-\lambda t} \\ &\leq \exp[\mu(e^\lambda - 1) - \lambda t].\end{aligned}$$

Assuming that $t < \mu$, this bound holds with $\lambda = \log(t/\mu)$, which upon evaluation gives

$$\mathbb{P}[X \leq t] \leq \exp[\mu(e^{\log(t/\mu)} - 1) - \log(t/\mu)t] = \exp[-\mu + t(1 + \log \frac{\mu}{t})].$$

□

Lemma A.3. *Let X be a binomial random variable with mean μ . Then for any $t > 4$*

$$\mathbb{P}[X \geq t\mu] \leq \exp\left[-\frac{t\mu \log(t)}{3}\right],$$

PROOF OF LEMMA A.3. The proof here is identical in approach to the proof of Lemma A.2. As there, it is possible to bound the Laplace transform of X as

$$\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda X} \leq \exp[\mu(e^\lambda - 1)],$$

for any real λ . For $\lambda > 0$, the tail bound follows from Markov's inequality by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}[X \geq t\mu] &= \mathbb{P}[e^{\lambda X} \geq e^{\lambda t\mu}] \\ &\leq [\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda X}] e^{-\lambda t\mu} \\ &\leq \exp[\mu(e^\lambda - 1) - \lambda t\mu].\end{aligned}$$

For $t > 1$, it is possible to take $\lambda = \log t$. This gives the bound on the tail probability

$$\mathbb{P}[X \geq t\mu] \leq \exp[\mu(t - 1 - t \log t)].$$

To complete the proof, it remains to show that $t - 1 \leq \frac{2}{3}t \log t$ when $t \geq 4$. The function $\frac{t}{t-1} \log t$ is monotonically increasing for $t > 1$, and thus it suffices to show that $\frac{4}{3} \log 4 \geq \frac{3}{2}$, or equivalently that $\log 4 \geq \frac{9}{8}$. This follows from $\log 4 = \int_1^4 \frac{1}{x} dx$ and bounding the integral from below by a right Riemann sum. □

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Aronshtam, N. Linial, T. Luczak, and R. Meshulam. Collapsibility and vanishing of top homology in random simplicial complexes. 2011.
- [2] Eric Babson, Christopher Hoffman, and Matthew Kahle. The fundamental group of random 2-complexes. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 24(1):1–28, 2011.
- [3] W. Ballmann and J. Świątkowski. On L^2 -cohomology and property (T) for automorphism groups of polyhedral cell complexes. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 7(4):615–645, 1997.
- [4] L. A. Bassalygo. Asymptotically optimal switching circuits. *Problems of Infor. Trans.*

- [5] Bachir Bekka, Pierre de la Harpe, and Alain Valette. *Kazhdan's property (T)*, volume 11 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.
- [6] Itai Benjamini, Simi Haber, Michael Krivelevich, and Eyal Lubetzky. The isoperimetric constant of the random graph process. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 32(1):101–114, 2008.
- [7] F. K. R. Chung. On concentrators, superconcentrators, generalizers and nonblocking networks. *Bell Sys. Tech. J.*, 58:1765–1777, 1978.
- [8] Fan Chung, Linyuan Lu, and Van Vu. The spectra of random graphs with given expected degrees. *Internet Math.*, 1(3):257–275, 2004.
- [9] Fan R. K. Chung. *Spectral graph theory*, volume 92 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC, 1997.
- [10] Amin Coja-Oghlan. On the Laplacian eigenvalues of $G_{n,p}$. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 16(6):923–946, 2007.
- [11] Dominic Dotterrer and Matthew Kahle. Coboundary expanders. Submitted, 2011.
- [12] P. Erdős and A. Rényi. On random graphs. I. *Publ. Math. Debrecen*, 6:290–297, 1959.
- [13] Uriel Feige and Eran Ofek. Spectral techniques applied to sparse random graphs. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 27(2):251–275, 2005.
- [14] J. Fox, M. Gromov, V. Lafforgue, A. Naor, and J. Pach. Overlap properties of geometric expanders. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1005.1392*, 2010.
- [15] David A. Freedman. On tail probabilities for martingales. *Ann. Probability*, 3:100–118, 1975.
- [16] Ehud Friedgut and Gil Kalai. Every monotone graph property has a sharp threshold. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 124(10):2993–3002, 1996.
- [17] J. Friedman, J. Kahn, and E. Szemerédi. On the second eigenvalue of random regular graphs. In *Proceedings of the twenty-first annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, STOC '89, pages 587–598, New York, NY, USA, 1989. ACM.
- [18] Joel Friedman. On the second eigenvalue and random walks in random d -regular graphs. *Combinatorica*, 11(4):331–362, 1991.
- [19] Z. Füredi and J. Komlós. The eigenvalues of random symmetric matrices. *Combinatorica*, 1(3):233–241, 1981.
- [20] Howard Garland. p -adic curvature and the cohomology of discrete subgroups of p -adic groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 97:375–423, 1973.
- [21] Eli Glasner. *Ergodic theory via joinings*, volume 101 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [22] Mikhail Gromov. Singularities, expanders and topology of maps. Part 2: From combinatorics to topology via algebraic isoperimetry. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 20(2):416–526, 2010.
- [23] Matthew Kahle. Topology of random clique complexes. *Discrete Math.*, 309(6):1658–1671, 2009.
- [24] Dmitry N. Kozlov. The threshold function for vanishing of the top homology group of random d -complexes. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 138(12):4517–4527, 2010.
- [25] Nathan Linial and Roy Meshulam. Homological connectivity of random 2-complexes. *Combinatorica*, 26(4):475–487, 2006.
- [26] G. A. Margulis. Explicit constructions of expanders. *Problemy Peredači Informacii*, 9(4):71–80, 1973.
- [27] R. Meshulam and N. Wallach. Homological connectivity of random k -dimensional complexes. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 34(3):408–417, 2009.
- [28] Yann Ollivier. *A January 2005 invitation to random groups*, volume 10 of *Ensaio Matemáticos [Mathematical Surveys]*. Sociedade Brasileira de Matemática, Rio de Janeiro, 2005.
- [29] M. Pinsker. On the complexity of a concentrator. *7th International Teletraffic Conference, Stockholm*, pages 318/1–318/4, 1973.
- [30] Nicholas Pippenger. Superconcentrators. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 6(2):298–304, 1977.
- [31] Alexander Soshnikov. Universality at the edge of the spectrum in Wigner random matrices. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 207(3):697–733, 1999.
- [32] Terence Tao and Van Vu. Random matrices: Universality of local eigenvalue statistics. *Acta Mathematica*, 206:127–204, 2011. 10.1007/s11511-011-0061-3.
- [33] Van H. Vu. Spectral norm of random matrices. *Combinatorica*, 27(6):721–736, 2007.
- [34] U. Wagner. Minors in random and expanding hypergraphs. In *Proceedings of the 27th annual ACM symposium on Computational geometry*, pages 351–360. ACM, 2011.

- [35] A. Żuk. Property (T) and Kazhdan constants for discrete groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 13(3):643–670, 2003.
- [36] Andrzej Żuk. La propriété (T) de Kazhdan pour les groupes agissant sur les polyèdres. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 323(5):453–458, 1996.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
E-mail address: `hoffman@math.washington.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
E-mail address: `kahle.70@math.osu.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
E-mail address: `paquette@math.washington.edu`